



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 September 2020

by K Savage BA MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/20/3253468

34 Littledale Road, Sheffield S9 4GB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Karim against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/04203/FUL, dated 20 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 30 April 2020.
 - The development proposed was originally described as 'Two storey side extension with gable and rear dormer to form loft conversion.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the two-storey side extension with gable and rear dormer extension. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to a single-storey rear extension and formation of a front porch, at 34 Littledale Road, Sheffield S9 4GB, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/04203/FUL, dated 20 November 2019 so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The front porch and single storey rear extension hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Plan and Location Plan; Existing Elevations and Floor Plans (Drawing 1 of 2 – February 2018); Drawing 2 'Proposed Elevations and Floor Plans' (Amended March 2020).
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development in the banner heading is taken from the application form; however, the submitted plans included additional proposed development, namely a single storey rear extension and front porch. The Council duly considered all of the elements shown on the plans, and I have done the same. The formal decision above reflects these additional elements.
3. The proposal was amended during the course of the application to omit proposed front dormer windows and the Council made its determination on this basis. I saw on site that a single storey wall had been constructed to the side

elevation, but for the avoidance of doubt, I have also determined the appeal against the revised plans.

Main Issue

4. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The proposal includes several distinct elements, namely a two storey side extension which would incorporate a hip-to-gable alteration at roof level; a flat roofed dormer window to the altered rear roof slope; a single storey rear extension and a front porch. Of these, the Council raises no objection to the single storey rear extension or the front porch.
6. I note in the planning history a recent application where the Council deemed its prior approval was not required for a single storey rear extension of the same size and form, which represents a clear fall-back position for the appellant. Nonetheless, I saw a number of extensions to the rear of neighbouring properties, in which context the proposed extension would not appear out of place. Its scale would not be excessive relative to the size of the dwelling or the rear garden, and there would remain sufficient space between the extension and the detached garage at the rear. This element of the proposal would therefore be acceptable.
7. I also saw several porches of varying designs dotted along the street on both sides. The proposed porch would accord with size guidelines in the Supplementary Planning Guidance on Designing House Extensions (July 1996) (SPG) and it would complement the style and materials of the dwellings. Therefore, it would not harm the appearance of the street scene.
8. The two storey side extension would represent a significant change to the massing of the building and its presence in the street scene, which I saw to comprise a consistent pattern of semi-detached pairs of dwellings with demonstrable gaps between them for parking and access to the rear gardens. This spacing adds a sense of openness and provides glimpses through to the tree line at the rear of the properties. The consistency of the built form is augmented by the hipped roofs which are almost universally retained.
9. The Council refers to Guideline 1 of the SPG which states that extensions should be compatible with the character and built form of the area. Guideline 2 adds that extensions shall not detract from the dwelling or general appearance of the street or locality, and that buildings with hipped roofs should have the roof of any two storey extension continue this feature, particularly if the extension is clearly visible in the street.
10. The extension would disrupt the consistent pattern of development through the introduction of a gable to the side elevation, which would be readily visible and discordant in views from the bottom end of the road where the rooflines of the street can be seen as a whole. Whilst I saw some isolated examples of two storey side extensions, these either had flat roofs which rose to eaves level and left the hipped roof intact, or they extended the roof but maintained the hipped form, in line with Guideline 2 of the SPG. The proposed extension would do neither, but would introduce an uncharacteristic and conspicuous form of development which would harm the consistency of the street scene.

11. I also note the Council's concern with a terracing effect being created. I saw that Nos 29 and 31 opposite have infilled the prominent spacing between the dwellings which has interrupted the pattern of development, albeit the retention of the hipped roofs means an element of physical and visual separation between the buildings is retained. The proposal, though it would not adjoin No 36 next door, would extend to the boundary and the gable form would make any discernible separation of the dwellings difficult to maintain should No 36 be extended and would exacerbate the adverse effect of the proposed extension.
12. In reaching a judgement, I have had regard to examples of hip-to-gable extensions within the surrounding area cited by the appellant; however, none of these are on Littledale Road and the proposal would not be seen in the same views as any of them. From my observations, the gable extensions cited are isolated exceptions to a consistent pattern of hipped roofed semi-detached pairs in the wider area, and do not justify a proposal which would be harmful for the reasons set out.
13. The proposed rear dormer would span across most of the enlarged roof and would form a substantial and conspicuous addition to the dwelling. There are no examples of dormer windows of any size to neighbouring properties, an absence influenced by the hipped roof forms which characterise the street. The size and high level position of the dormer, together with the massing of the gable addition, would create an effective third storey at the rear of the dwelling which would appear dominant and imposing relative to surrounding dwellings when seen from neighbouring gardens.
14. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed side extension and rear dormer would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the area, and would conflict with Policy CS74 of the Core Strategy (March 2009) and saved Policies BE5 and H14 of the Unitary Development Plan (March 1998), which together seek high quality developments which are in scale and character with neighbouring buildings and respect and enhance the townscape. There would also be conflict with the SPG and Paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework which states that developments need to contribute towards creating visually attractive, distinctive places to live, work and visit, whilst also being sympathetic to local character.
15. However, I conclude that the proposed single storey rear extension and front porch would preserve the character and appearance of the area, and no conflict would arise with the aforementioned policies in respect of these elements of the appeal scheme.

Other Considerations

16. The Council did not identify harm in respect of the living conditions of neighbouring occupants. The adjoining dwelling at No 32 has a shallow rear extension and stands at a slightly higher level relative to the appeal site. As such, the additional projection of the single storey rear extension would not be excessive in depth or height and would not appear overbearing from the neighbouring property. There would no adverse effect on No 36 on the other side as the rear extension would be set well in from the boundary.
17. The side extension would sit between the front and rear building lines and would not impose upon the main windows of any neighbouring property. Views

from proposed windows would be no different to those possible from existing windows, and neighbours would not suffer a harmful loss of privacy.

18. The Council indicates that the proposal would retain sufficient off-street parking space and there would be no adverse effect on parking or highway safety and, having seen the site and the availability of on-street parking, I have no reasons to conclude otherwise.

Conclusion

19. The appeal proposal includes a number of different elements. The proposed porch and single storey rear extension would be acceptable and would comply with relevant planning policies. These developments are clearly severable from the remainder of the scheme, as they are physically and functionally independent. Therefore, I shall issue a split decision in this case, and allow the porch and single storey rear extension.
20. In respect of the side extension and gable and dormer extensions at roof level, I have concluded that these would have a materially adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the area. This is severable from the aforementioned acceptable development. Therefore, I dismiss the appeal in respect of the proposed side extension and gable and dormer extensions at roof level.
21. Planning permission is granted for the acceptable parts of the proposal subject to the standard three year time limit condition. In the interests of certainty, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area, a materials condition is also necessary.

K Savage

INSPECTOR